



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*ch*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/306,448 05/06/99 WILLIAMSON

W

GM22/0719  
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.  
2700 CAREW TOWER  
441 VINE STREET  
CINCINNATI OH 45202

EXAMINER
----------

PREBILIC, P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3738

DATE MAILED: 07/19/01

15

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/306,448

Applicant(s)

Williamson IV et al

Examiner

Paul Prebilit

Group Art Unit  
3738



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Paul Prebilit

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Kevin Rooney

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jul 17, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: claims 1-20

Identification of prior art discussed:

Williamson IV et al (US 5,716,370)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Applicant's Representative, Mr. Kevin Rooney, queried whether 35 USC 103(c) could be applied since common ownership exists. The Examiner, however, noted that MPEP 2141 states that for cases filed prior to November 29, 1999, 35 USC 103(c) only removes Section 102(f) and (g) rejections not Section 102(e) rejections. Also, the Examiner noted that the Ortiz declaration was not sufficient because MPEP 716.10 indicates that the common inventors need to file the Rule 132 declarations not the uncommon inventors. Mr. Rooney said that he would consider filing a CPA or Rule 132 declarations and show common ownership in order to overcome the rejection. The Examiner agreed that filing the Rule 132 declarations and common ownership showing would not be refused entry at this point since it was attempted earlier.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

PAUL PREBIT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 3738